

Mille Lacs Women's Project.
 Minneapolis Intervention Project.
 Mujeres Unidas/Los Ninos.
 North Memorial Women's Center.
 North Shore Horizons Women's Resource Center.
 Northwoods Coalition for Battered Women.
 OtterTail County Crisis Center.
 PEARL: Battered Women's Resource Center.
 Phyllis Wheatley Community Center.
 Pillsbury Neighborhood Services.
 Pope County Outreach PRIDE (Women Used In Prostitution).
 Project P.E.A.C.E.
 Ramsey Intervention Project.
 Range Women's Advocates.
 Rape and Abuse Crisis Center.
 Refuge.
 Refuge East.
 Refuge North.
 Region IV Council on Domestic Violence.
 Rivers of Hope—Buffalo.
 Rivers of Hope—Elk River.
 Safe Journey.
 SAFE, Inc.
 St. Cloud Intervention Project.
 St. Paul Intervention Project.
 Sheller House/Woodland Centers.
 Sojourner Project.
 Sojourner Project intervention.
 Southern Minnesota Crisis Support Center.
 Southern Valley Alliance for Battered Women.
 Southern Valley Intervention Project.
 Southwest Crisis Center.
 Stevens County Outreach.
 Traverse County Outreach.
 Tuning Point for Victims of Domestic Abuse.
 Unity/Waite House.
 Victim's Crisis Center.
 Violence Intervention Project (CADA).
 Violence Intervention Project—Ada.
 Violence Intervention Project—Crookston.
 Violence Intervention Project—Hallock.
 Violence Intervention Project—Rouseau.
 Violence Intervention Project—Thief River Falls.
 Waseca Area Violence Intervention Project.
 Washington County Intervention Services.
 Wilkin County Outreach.
 W.I.N.D.O.W.
 Wilder Community Assistance Program.
 Wilder Domestic Abuse Program.
 Winona Domestic Assault Intervention Project.
 Woman House.
 Woman House advocates at St. Cloud hospital.
 WomanKind (Fairview Ridges).
 WomanKind (Fairview Southdale).
 WomanKind (Fairview University).
 WomanSafe.
 Women Alive Crisis Center "Equay Be Mah De See Win".
 Women of Nations Eagles' Nest Shelter.
 Women of Nallons Community Advocacy Project.
 Women's Advocates.
 Women's Center, Inc.
 Women's Center of Mid-Minnesota.
 Women's Coalition.
 Women's Resource Center of Steele County.
 Women's Resource Center.
 WRAP of Cottonwood County.
 WRAP of Lincoln County.
 WRAP of Redwood Co.
 Women's Shelter.
 Women's Shelter intervention Project.
 Womenspace.
 Yellow Medicine Women's Center.
 African American Family Service.
 Battered Women's Programs.
 Battered Women's Justice Project.
 Battered Women's Legal Advocacy Project.

Black, Indian, Hispanic & Asian Women In Action.

BrotherPeace.
 Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women.
 Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center.

Mr. President, we should also note that this year marks the fourth anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act. Through increased sentences, grants to State governments for prevention programs and other services, and the new national domestic abuse hotline, the Violence Against Women Act has contributed significantly toward protecting individuals from sexual offenses and domestic abuse. I am proud to have supported this landmark legislation as a member of the House of Representatives during the 103rd Congress.

Since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act, funding provided for these programs has led to the further development of policies to prevent and respond to domestic abuse incidents. This includes specialized domestic violence court advocates who obtain protection orders, in conjunction with greater support to enhance the ability of prosecutors and law enforcement to punish those who commit these crimes.

Despite these important achievements, the number of siblings, spouses, and children subjected to domestic abuse remains too high. Regrettably, most victims of domestic violence are women.

According to the Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women, 210 Minnesota women died from domestic abuse between 1988 and 1997. Sadly, this loss of life underscores the importance of increasing public awareness regarding domestic violence and the community-based organizations that are working to prevent others from falling victim to this violence.

Mr. President, domestic abuse is not limited to the privacy of households. In many places of businesses, battered individuals are subjected to emotional abuse in the form of threatening phone calls and harassment.

Fortunately, companies have begun to recognize that employees who are subject to domestic violence at home are more likely to be absent from work and less productive at their jobs.

In fact, a recent survey of corporate senior executives by Roper Starch Worldwide on behalf of Liz Claiborne, Inc. found that: Fifty-seven percent of those surveyed believe that domestic violence is a major problem in society; thirty-three percent feel that domestic abuse had a negative impact on their bottom lines; and four out of ten executives surveyed were personally aware of employees and other individuals affected by domestic violence.

I commend efforts by private sector employers who have responded to this problem by establishing Employee Assistance Programs and other services that will safely protect employees who have become domestic violence victims.

Mr. President, Minnesotans will have the opportunity this month to participate in a variety of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month initiatives. Throughout October, citizens will raise public awareness through candlelight vigils, rallies, and marches throughout our communities.

One of the more creative programs will be an art exhibit honoring 30 Minneapolis public high school students who are finalists in the "Speak Up" domestic violence awareness poster contest.

This initiative, co-sponsored by the Harriet Tubman Center and Intermedia Arts in Minneapolis, will encourage students to increase public awareness and prevention of family violence. The competition will award scholarships to twelve individuals who present various domestic violence themes in their artwork.

Next fall, these works will be part of the Annual Domestic Violence Art exhibit in the Russell Senate Office Building sponsored by my colleague, Senator Paul WELLSTONE.

I am certain many Members of Congress will visit this exhibit to admire the important contributions of these young Minnesotans toward raising the consciousness of our communities about the issue of domestic abuse.

Domestic violence is not an insurmountable problem facing our society. We must work together to curb this problem that crosses over economical, cultural, and political boundaries.

Through the efforts of community groups, families, and law enforcement, Americans can take meaningful steps toward eradicating the presence of this crime in their daily lives.

PRINCIPLE, COURAGE, AND TAX CUTS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to take the remaining part of my time this morning to talk about a subject I have worked on for the 6 years I have been in Congress, and that is trying to raise the awareness of the issue of taxes in this country, that we are now taxed at an all-time high, and that Americans need and deserve some form of tax relief.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to take time to rise today to express my disappointment over the Senate's failure to fulfill its obligations to the taxpayers to consider and to pass any kind of tax relief bill this year.

Fiscally, socially, morally, this is a tremendous mistake, and I believe my colleagues are wrong. I am equally disappointed at President Clinton's threats to veto this important legislation had it passed. It is the same case as last year when, in the State of Virginia, when then-candidate for Governor Gilmore was pledging a tax cut of his own. The President said at that time that Virginians would be "selfish" to vote for tax relief. This year he says "to squander money on a tax cut"—again, that is how President

Clinton is describing our attempt this year to let working Americans keep more of their money—"to squander money on a tax cut."

Unfortunately, there is a pattern here, and apparently neither President Clinton nor the rest of Washington has changed their mind. Both want as much money as they can get from the taxpayers, so they can spend it the way they think is best.

According to Webster's Dictionary, the definition of "squander" is "to spend extravagantly or foolishly." I say to President Clinton that I am shocked that you actually believe taxpayers squander their salaries in this way and that only Washington can spend the money wisely. With such highly placed disregard for the fiscal abilities of the American people, I believe it is no wonder that Washington has been unwilling to give the taxpayers more control over their own dollars.

Let me focus first this morning, Mr. President, on the budget surplus. In a recent series of high-profile celebrations, folks here in Washington could hardly wait to rush to the cameras to claim credit for the \$70 billion budget surplus, watching them slap their own backs with their hands. Politicians have been humming happy ditties all around this town while approving big-ticket spending items right and left. Meanwhile, those same politicians pontificate about preserving the surplus to "save Social Security first."

The truth is, the White House didn't generate this surplus, nor did the U.S. House or the Senate. The politicians have no rightful claim to the surplus. Washington should not be allowed to sit around and dream up ways to spend even more money because a surplus has arrived. Working Americans are responsible for propelling our economy forward and generating this budget surplus, and they deserve to get it back as tax relief. There should be no debate. Taxpayers have overpaid, and, like any other time a person overpays for anything, they ought to get it back. If you go into a store and pay too much for an item, you expect to get the change back. But somehow in Washington, if you overpay, that is just too bad, Washington wants to pocket your money.

The surplus is the product of the recent revenue surge—a surge, I believe, generated directly by increased productivity and increased individual income tax payments, including the payment of capital gains taxes as investors took advantage of the lower capital gains rate—again, proving that reducing the tax rates can actually increase revenues, because the economy will grow. Very little of the surplus comes from policy changes, however, related to deficit reduction.

On the other hand, there are others in this Chamber who claim there is no surplus, that if we subtract the dollars Washington has routinely raided from the Social Security trust fund, the

Government is still in the red. Therefore, they oppose using the unified budget surplus for any kind of tax relief.

Mr. President, they are right on the facts, but I believe they are dead wrong about the conclusion. Washington's big spenders are the ones who have exhausted every penny of the Social Security surplus. They have already exhausted every penny of the Social Security surplus on other Government programs. They have wish lists. The taxpayers shouldn't be denied relief from a stifling tax burden just because Washington has managed to juggle the Nation's bank accounts.

I urge my colleagues to review the CBO's "August Economic and Budget Outlook," which shows precisely where revenues will come from in the next 10 years. The data shows that the greatest share of the projected budget surplus comes directly from income taxes paid by the taxpayers, not the FICA taxes. In 1998, individual income, corporate, and estate taxes make up nearly 80 percent of total tax revenue growth, while the share of FICA tax is about 20 percent. General tax revenues are expected to grow by \$723 billion, or 60 percent, over the next 10 years.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the taxpayers generated the surplus, outside the money earmarked for Social Security, and the Government has no right to absorb it. It is only moral and fair to return at least a part of it to the taxpayers.

If we don't return at least a portion of the surplus to the taxpayers, and do it soon, Washington is going to spend it, leaving nothing then for tax relief for the vitally important task of actually trying to preserve and save Social Security. Such spending will only enlarge the Government, and if the Government is enlarged today, it will make it even more expensive to support it in the future.

Mr. President, the situation we find ourselves in today reflects two very fundamentally different principles of government: Are we going to embrace tax cuts for working Americans, or are we going to embrace more spending for social engineering?

I am proud to serve here as a member of the Republican Party—a party which, since its creation, has firmly held that a person owns himself, a person owns his labor, and a person owns the fruits of his labor. We believe the pursuit of individual and States rights and a restricted role for the Federal Government create economic growth and prosperity.

The two parties have traditionally offered a marked choice—a choice between the Democratic Party belief that people should work for the Government or our vision of a Government that works for the people. One party believes that it has a right to spend every penny that it can take from working Americans—again echoing the President's words that people are "selfish" to want to cut taxes or to "squander money on a tax cut."

The Republican Party, on the other hand, believes Government should be limited only to that amount needed for necessary services, and this is, indeed, a choice between two futures: a choice between small Government or big Government, a choice between fiscal discipline or irresponsibility, a choice between individual freedom or servitude to a bigger Government, responsibility or dependency, long-term economic prosperity for the Nation or some short-term benefits for the special interest groups and the politicians who feed them.

Mr. President, that is exactly why the American taxpayers ushered in an era of Republican congressional leadership in 1994, a new majority that pledged to provide fiscal discipline, individual freedom, personal responsibility, and prosperity for all people.

Unfortunately, Congress has so far delivered on only a small portion of that pledge, blocked by the competing forces of tax-and-spend versus tax relief and personal empowerment. The choice I spoke of a moment ago has become blurred as both parties fight in a misguided effort to purchase some measure of the people's trust.

They think you can run out and with their own money buy the trust of the American people. But in doing so, Congress has allowed annual Federal spending to increase from \$1.5 trillion in 1994 to \$1.73 trillion today. In fact, Federal spending has never been higher. During the same period, the national debt has grown from \$4.9 trillion to \$5.7 trillion, an \$810 billion increase in our national debt.

Mr. President, take a look at the current debate over the supplemental spending to be included in the omnibus appropriations bill. A week ago, we were hearing encouraging words that much of this would be offset by cuts in other programs. Now, as we careen toward adjournment, it appears there will be as much as \$20 billion in emergency spending—out of the surplus, of course—and the report this morning is that there could be even more as we work and maybe have to give in to the administration demands for more money to be spent in order to avoid a Government shutdown.

Mr. President, despite a \$70 billion budget surplus, total taxation is at an all-time high. The tax relief Congress enacted last year does not go nearly far enough. I am proud we had the courage to enact the \$500 per-child tax credit, which I authored in 1993, but when our tax bill overall returns to the taxpayers only one cent for every dollar they send to Washington—especially now, during a time of surpluses—I believe we have failed them miserably.

Working Americans see their earnings taxed, and then re-taxed repeatedly. Washington taxes their income when they first earn it. It is then subject to excise taxes when they spend it. And their savings and investments are also taxed. And when they die, the Government is the first to put their hands into the estate.

Farmers and small business owners cannot easily pass their businesses on to their families because the huge estate and gift taxes still exist. The government imposes a 43 percent tax on all American couples simply because they are married. Even seniors—retired people in our country, our senior citizens—they have their earned benefits taxed.

If the 105th Congress was supposed to be about cutting taxes and forever reforming the tax system—and I believe that was our mandate—the 105th Congress did not complete the job.

Our progress has fizzled not because our efforts have lost the support of the people—in fact, two thirds of the American people supported tax relief during the 1996 elections, and broad tax relief still enjoys overwhelming support today—but because some in Congress have lost their backbones. They have lost the courage to make a stand on principle and not abandon their moral compass at the first sign of resistance.

In too many instances, this Congress has become a willing collaborator of President Clinton's tax-and-spend policies. We have helped to build a bigger, more expensive government, and in doing so have abandoned our promise of tax relief for working Americans.

Mr. President, each time Congress makes a promise to the taxpayers—and then deserts them—Congress comforts itself by saying it would come back next year and enact an even larger tax cut. This is self-deceiving at best.

If we do not take a stand today, what is going to happen to make us more courageous a year from now? Besides, each year we wait, the Government takes an ever-greater bite of the earnings of working Americans and the Government gets bigger and becomes harder to trim in the future.

Another point I would like to make, Mr. President, is that a tax cut is not spending. Only in convoluted book-keeping practices of Washington would we consider a cut in tax rates to be spending. The reason is simple: first, it is the taxpayers' money that supports and keeps the Government running; second, tax relief not only ensures a healthy and strong economy, but also generates more revenues for the Government.

In a recent study, economists at the Institute for Policy Innovation concluded that the House-passed tax relief bill of \$80 billion—an unforgivably moderate tax relief measure, in my view—would add an additional \$300 billion to our GDP and create more than 135,000 jobs. This economic growth would in turn generate about \$80 billion in additional revenues to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, when it comes to federal spending, Washington rarely asks how the American taxpayers can afford to give up more of their income to the government, and how such excessive spending will affect a working family's budget and finances. Equally upsetting is the fact that when it comes to tax

relief, Washington is always reluctant to act.

Oh, they say it is easy to give an election year tax cut. That is impossible around here. It is hard to get a tax cut. It is easy to spend; it is very hard to give tax relief. Congress even goes so far as to compel tax cut advocates to pay for any tax relief via Washington's PAYGO rule. That is a rule that requires increasing taxes on some or lowering entitlement benefits in order to cut tax relief to others. Nothing is more ridiculous than the requirement of the PAYGO rule. We must repeal it so we can do the job of shrinking the size of the Government and let working families keep more of the money, the money they earn in order to spend it on their priorities—not Washington priorities.

One major reason for the failure of this year's tax relief bill is that Washington's spin doctors took full advantage of Americans' anxiety about Social Security. "Save Social Security first" is just another Washington lie. Mark my word, Mr. President, Social Security crisis or not, Washington has spent, and will continue to spend, surplus dollars whenever it can for its pet programs.

Since 1983, Washington has raided more than \$700 billion from the trust funds for non-Social Security programs, and Congress approved that spending every time. In the next 5 years, the Federal Government will raid another \$600 billion from the Social Security trust funds. Those politicians who insist on using the surplus for Social Security have voted for most, if not all, of those spending bills, and so it is those politicians who in the last 15 years have stripped the trust funds of any surplus.

Mr. President, despite the rhetoric about saving Social Security, few have come up with a concrete plan to save it. The problem is that by law, the Social Security surplus has to be put into Treasury securities. That means Washington can legally use the money to fund its favorite non-Social Security programs, rendering these "assets" little more than Treasury IOUs. Unless we change the law, Washington will continue to abuse Social Security until it goes broke.

I agree that reforming Social Security to ensure its solvency is vitally important. Any projected budget surplus should be used partly for that purpose. In fact, I have introduced a bill to just do that. Yet, I believe strongly that the surplus alone will not save Social Security and therefore fundamental reform is needed to change it from a pay-as-you-go system to a fully funded one.

Mr. President, the States offer us an excellent model of how we should use the budget surplus. In recent years, many Governors have cut taxes and shrunk the size of their governments, and in the process have turned budget deficits into surpluses. They are now using those surpluses to provide even

further tax relief. Some States, such as Missouri and Florida, even have constitutional or statutory requirements to return to taxpayers any revenues that exceed income growth.

The States have proved that if government performs only legitimate and necessary functions, and does so without waste, it can leave much more money in the pockets of the people. And it is the people who can best spend their money, whether it is for their children's health care, saving for a college education, giving more to their church and charities, or just helping to set something aside for their retirement.

Now, Mr. President, back to the question of the budget surplus and who should spend this money—the Government or the workers who earned it?

In conclusion, Washington's tax and spending policies have systematically ignored our children's future and severely undermined the basic functions of the family. We must abandon those policies and help restore the family to an economic position capable of fulfilling its vital responsibilities. In answer to my own question, we must provide American families with meaningful tax relief, allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned money.

It is their money. Let us give it back.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senators from Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. BINGAMAN, have until 6 p.m. tonight to file the Valles Caldera Preservation Act for purposes of introducing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, without objection, it is so ordered.

OSHA LEGISLATION DURING THE 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I can think of few issues that are more important to the average American than the safety and health of our Nation's workers. During the last 2 years, Congress stepped up to the plate and confronted this important issue head-on. The end result was three separate bills becoming law that amended the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. Until this year, in 28 years, the act was amended one time—in 1990—and that was to increase fines. The American workplace has changed quite a bit over the last three decades and I'm pleased that Congress is now changing, too.

During the first session of the 105th Congress, I introduced a comprehensive piece of legislation with the support of